

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 1, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed June 1, 2007, claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, claims 4, 6, 8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 1, 2, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105, hereinafter Martin) in view of Adams, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,334,145, hereinafter Adams). Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of De Boor, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204, hereinafter De Boor). Claims 6, 8, 10-14 have similar limitations as claims 1-5, and 7, and therefore they were rejected under the same rationale.

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends claims 1, 8, 13, and 14, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-8 and 10-14. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added to these claims. Reconsideration of the claims in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested.

III. Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, Claims 4, 6, 8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the office action it was stated that it is unclear what happens if the link is not a street address or email address for limitations "if one of the one or more Web content data items comprises a street address, then..." and "if one of the one or more Web content data items comprises an email address, then..."

For claims 10 and 11, it is considered that these claims end at the limitation of “parsing...” if the “if” condition is not met. Applicants have not made amendments to these claims because an “otherwise” clause would state that no action should be taken. For claims 4, 6, and 8, it is interpreted that if the conditions of these limitations are not met that these limitations are not considered. Applicants have not made amendments to these claims because an “otherwise” clause would state that no action should be taken. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 6, 8, 10, and 11 properly conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 13 and 14 have been amended to remove references to the step of detecting and/or searching. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 14 now properly conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, and 12-14 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105, hereinafter Martin) in view of Adams, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,334,145, hereinafter Adams).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. As amended, claim 1 defines:

1. (Currently amended) A method for providing dynamic data detection from Web content information for a mobile device comprising the steps of:
 - receiving a URL from a user;
 - accessing a Web page identified by the URL;
 - parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page; and
 - displaying to the mobile device one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more Web content data items, each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item, for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication.

Claim 1 has been amended to require parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more *non-hyperlink* Web content data items in the Web page. “Web content data items” are not hyperlinks. Instead, as used in the Specification, they are regular content of an accessed Web page, such as a telephone number, an address, and an email address. (Spec., p. 8, lines 20-21, 26-27 and p.8 line 30-p.9 line 2).

Adams discloses scanning the displayed home page for all provided links or URL addresses. (col. 12, lines 50-51). Scanning a page for links, as disclosed in Adams, is not the same as parsing a page for non-hyperlink Web content data items, as required by claim 1. Thus, Adams does not teach parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 has also been amended to require displaying to the mobile device one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more Web content data items, each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item *for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication*. Link indications are provided for the Web content data items. These links provide a *service* from the mobile device through a wireless connection. For example, telephone number links may be accessed to dial the listed number, links to addresses may be accessed to access a map for locating the address, and links to email addresses may be accessed to send an email to the email address. (Spec., p. 8, lines 20-24, 26-29, and p. 8 line 30-p. 9, line 2). Each service, such as dialing a phone number, displaying a map, or sending an emailing, is related to a type of Web content data item, such as telephone numbers, addresses, and emails.

Martin discloses a plurality of links to available services. (col. 3, lines 33-34). Martin does not discuss what these services might be. Martin does disclose, however, that if a user clicks on one of the hyperlinks, the user will be taken to content, for example a Web page. (col. 9, lines 25-27). A link providing access to a Web page, as disclosed in Martin, is not the same as a link providing access to a service related to a type of Web content data item, as required by claim 1. Further, Martin also discloses a shared database service that can be used to create a different user interface for the mobile or desktop device depending on the device type. (col. 9, lines 32-34). Because this service disclosed in Martin creates different user interfaces, this

service is not accessed by a link indication and is not related to a type of Web content data item, as required by claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Martin and Adams fail to teach or suggest parsing the currently accessed Web page dynamically in real time to identify one or more non-hyperlink Web content data items in the Web page; and displaying to the mobile device one or more link indications that correspond to the one or more Web content data items, each link indication providing a link to a service through a wireless connection from the mobile device, and each service performing a service related to a type of Web content data item for the Web content data item corresponding to the link indication, as required by claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Martin or Arnold, taken alone or in combination, and respectfully request reconsideration of the claim.

Claims 2 and 12-14

Claims 2 and 12-14 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 12-14 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations, which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al., in view of De Boor, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204).

Claims 3-5 and 7

Claims 3-5 and 7 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-5 and 7 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations, which render them patentable in their own right.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

In the office action, it was stated that claims 6, 8, 10-14 have similar limitations as claims 1-5, and 7, and therefore they were rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 10

Claim 10 requires displaying to the mobile device by the online map service the location of the street address on an online map if the user selects the link indication to activate the link. The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that none of claims 1-5, and 7 teach this element of claim 10. For this reason and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Claim 6 requires displaying to the mobile device the location of the street address on an online map. The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that none of claims 1-5, and 7 teach this element of claim 6. For this reason and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 11

Claim 11 requires initiating an email to the email address by the mobile device using the email service if the user selects the link indication to activate the link. The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that none of claims 1-5, and 7 teach this element of claim 11. For this reason and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 8

Claim 8 has been amended to require initiating an email to the email address by the mobile device. The comments provided above with respect to claim 11 are hereby incorporated by reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2007

By: /Julie Daniels Missud/

Julie Daniels Missud
Reg. No. 51,330

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910